26 JANUARY 1948

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

| Defense' Witnesses | Page |
|---|-------|
| KANDA, Masatane | 38233 |
| Direct by General Vasiliev | 38233 |
| NOON RECESS | 38237 |
| Direct (cont'd) by General Vasiliev | 38238 |
| (Witness stood down until 9:30 A.M. tomorrow morn- ing) | 38246 |
| Grebennik, Kuzma | 38284 |
| Direct by General Vasiliev | 38284 |

INDEX

of

EXHIBITS

| | ef. Pros. | Description Ide | r In nt.Evidenç |
|-------|-----------|---|--------------------|
| 3361 | 3850 | Telegram dated 2 March 1941 from Rintelen to the Minister Bureau, | |
| | | Berlin | 38195 |
| | | MORNING RECESS | 38216 |
| 1952 | 3851 | Minutes of the Trial held on 31 August and 1 Sep- tember 1935 in Irkutsk by the Assizes of the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR 382 | r 227 |
| 1952A | 3851-A | Excerpts therefrom | 38228 |
| 3087 | 3852 | Affidavit of KANDA, Masatane | 38237 |
| 2460 | 698 | Copy of the Anti-Soviet Strategy Plan of Major KANDA when he was serving in the Special Service Division, Japanese Army, | 29042 |
| | | Herbin | 38243 |
| 3334 | 3651 | Memorandum on the Basic Principles of the Purchase of the Chinese Eastern Railway by Manchoukuo (submitted by the Soviet Delegation at the Meeting | |
| | | on 3 July 1933) | 38250 |
| | | AFTERNOON RECESS | 38266 |

26 JANUARY 1948

INDEX

4

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

| Doc. | Def. No. | Pros. | <u>Description</u> | For In Ident. Evidence |
|-------|-------------|-------|--|------------------------|
| 2329B | | 3853 | Extracts from the Book "Great Manchurian Empire" - The Problem of Racial Harmony and Spiritual Unity of East Asiatic Nations | 38271 |
| 3353 | A L | 3854 | Affidavit of Grebennik, Ku | zma 38288 |

Monday, 26 January 1948

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

at 0930. 9

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China, not sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE JUSTICE LORD PATRICK, Member from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and HONORABLE J'STICE JARANILLA, Member from the Commonwealth of the Philippines, not sitting from 1300 to 1600.

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST

Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

23

24

Morse & Kapleau

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except the accused SHIRATORI, who is represented by counsel. The Sugamo prison surgeon certifies he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

With the Tribunal's permission the accused ARAKI will be absent from the courtroom the entire day, conferring with his counsel.

Mr. Oneto.

MR. ONETO: I will now read to the Court IPS document No. 3363, admitted in evidence as exhibit No. 3849:

"TELEGRAM. Secret.

"Paris, 1 March 1941.

"For GFM.

"No. 716 of 3/1 Most Urgent

"Dr. Schwarzmann, Minister Bureau for the Foreign Minister.

"Ambassador de Brinon delivered this afternoon at 1800 hrs. a communication received from Admiral DARLAN concerning the Japanese offer of mediation in the Indo-China dispute, with a request in accordance with the last paragraph of this communication to appeal

*

9

23

24

to the influence the Reich's Government has in Tokyo, in order that the slight alleviations which the French Government asks for may not be denied them.

"The wording of the communication is as follows:

"Through my telegram of 26 February you are acquainted with the reasons on account of what the French Government does not find itself in a position to accept the offer of a mediation which was delivered to it on 25 February by the Japanese Government in its capacity as go-between in the conflict between 12 France and Thailand. As concerns this refusal Mr. 13 MATSUOKA has taken up a new attitude by appearing no 14 longer as a go-between but as an arbitrator (he) has given his claim the character of a formal demand and has added that in case of a refusal, Japan would abandon the mediation and depart from the position laid down in the Franco-Japanese agreement of 30 August in order to guarantee the settling of the affair by other means.

"Since France is not in a position to withstand this threat, nothing remains to the Government but to yield to the peremptory demands which have been presented to it in this way. Appropriate instructions were transmitted yesterday evening to our ambassador in

Tokyo.

17

19

20

21

to the influence the Reich's Government has in Tokyo, in order that the slight alleviations which the French Government asks for may not be denied them.

"The wording of the communication is as follows:

"Through my telegram of 26 February you are acquainted with the reasons on account of what the French Government does not find itself in a position to accept the offer of a mediation which was delivered to it on 25 February by the Japanese Government in its capacity as go-between in the conflict between 12 France and Thailand. As concerns this refusal Mr. 13 MATSUOKA has taken up a new attitude by appearing no 14 longer as a go-between but as an arbitrator (he) has given his claim the character of a formal demand and has added that in case of a refusal, Japan would abandon the mediation and depart from the position laid down in the Franco-Japanese agreement of 30 August in order to guarantee the settling of the affair by other means.

"Since France is not in a position to withstand this threat, nothing remains to the Government but to yield to the peremptory demands which have been presented to it in this way. Appropriate instructions were transmitted yesterday evening to our ambassador in Tokyo.

17

20

21

"The Japanese offer of mediation has accordingly been accepted as a whole.

"The only alterations the French Government requests are the following":

I will omit the following details and skip to the last paragraph:

"I would therefore be thankful to you if when informing the German Ambassador of the latest development of the question you would appeal to what authority the Reich exercises in Tokyo, so that these slight alleviations be not denied.

"For Fleet Admiral Rochat.

"Schleier."

12

13

14

17

24

25

I will now offer in evidence LPS document No. 3361. It is a Teletype dated 2 March 1941 by 16 Rintelen to the Minister Bureau, Berlin, of the German Foreign Office.

18 This document is the direct answer to telegram No. 716, court exhibit 3849, which was previously tendered in evidence. It shows the close cooperation of Germany 21 and Japan with regard to French Indo-China and the free hand given in this matter by Germany to Japan. 23

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms. CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3361 will receive exhibit No. 3850.

(Thereupon, the document above

2

2

5

6

8

10

12

13

14 15 16

17

18

21

22

20

23

25

referred to was marked prosecution exhibit

MR. ONETO: I will now read IPS document No. 3361, exhibit 3850:

"TELEGRAM.

"FUSCHL, 2 Merch 1941.

"No. 134 of 2 March.

"To the Minister Bureau, Berlin, via State Secretary to Under State Secretary WOERMANN and Ambassador STAHMER.

"Re Telegram No. 716 from Paris of 1 March, with regard to the French attitude in the Indo-Chinese dispute, the German Foreign Minister has directed that the French request contained in the telegram not be acceded to. In view of the new state of affairs arising from the telegram the Japanese ambassador should be informed by Ambassador STAHMER as a follow-up of the conversations so far of the fact that the German Foreign Minister does not intend to support the French request, but intends to leave the position to be taken entirely with the Japanese Government.

"Signed: RINTELEN."

We will not present the last document number, 3362, and we withdraw it from list No. 11-A.

The Russian Division will now continue for

the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer for identification prosecution document No. 3048, the Japanese Militant Graphic (Gunkoku Gaho) for April 1904, and excerpts therefrom containing the Imperial Rescript of February 10, 1904, declaring war on Russia, and a war account by a military correspondent, in evidence.

These excerpts show that Japan made the declaration of war two days after her attack, and that the Japanese press boasted of the commencement of military operations without warning.

I ask the Tribunal to take into consideration the fact that the prosecution did not produce any ag evidence on this issue, whereas the defense introduced a number of documents (exhibits Nos. 2286, 2287, 2288, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302) taking advantage of the statement made by the President of the Tribunal to the effect that relations between Japan and Russia for the last 50 years might be of interest to the Tribunal, page 17288 of the transcript.

In reply to this defense evidence we are offering only one document mentioned by me.

tion of reg two stops ofter her stores, and that the Jensmann rease harsted of the commences at of mili- ! term aparty times at though a rape.

I nek the tributed to sale into constante-

tion the first that the presention will not produce unying

1

8 9

11

10

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

23

22

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: In so far as this constitutes a proffer of evidence, I wish to object to it.

objected to the tender of evidence such as that now offered and to follow on the grounds of remoteness from the issues, irrelevance and immateriality under the Indictment as here framed. I believe I am correct in saying that no unequivocal ruling was made on those objections but that the Tribunal said that while such evidence might be difficult to connect it would be accepted subject to the establishment of any relevance. For example at page 7,317 of the record.

Now here we have in this excerpt two separate documents both relating to the year 1904. Of course, despite counsel's decription, this is not an issue in this case, and I submit that the rescript of Japan declaring war on Russian in the month of April, 1904, can have no conceivable connection with this case, with the issues here or with any of the defendants now on trial here.

This is proffered expressly for the stated purpose of showing that military operations in that war of 1904 commenced prior to the publication, at all events, of this declaration of war. But of course,

if that be the fact proof of it can avail counsel nothing here for as of 1904 there existed no suggestion of a requirement in international law that such a declaration of war be served and, in fact, the conduct of Japan in that time was given the express eachet of approval of most of the leading authorities of international law of America and England.

This evidence, therefore, it is submitted, has no importance because it relates to no issue before this Tribunal and has no probative value, therefore, directed toward any such issue.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I would like to reply to defense counsel.

We only rebut the evidence offered by the defense, and I want to call the attention of the Tribunal that the defense offered at least seven documents relating to that period and even to the period of time ten years before that. Your Honor, I have enumerated those seven documents offered by the defense when I addressed the Tribunal. As this document offered by me rebuts the documents offered by the defense we consider its tender quite proper at this stage. If I understood Mr. Blakeney correctly he intended to withdraw the documents previously offered by the defense. If that is the intention of Mr. Blakeney he must make this intention quite clear to us.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is a matter of history, General, and if it is relevant and material, but it may be difficult to see that it is, we can take judicial notice of it. You did not think enough of it to prove it in chief. You are only nutting this in because the defense put in certain documents.

By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

GENERAL VASILIEV: In this case I would like to have the direction of the Tribunal how I should proceed further. If the Tribunal thinks that the Tribunal can take judicial notice of that fact may I proceed on the basis of that in my future tender of documents?

THE PRESIDENT: You can invite us to do so, General, There is nothing to prevent you.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I beg your pardon, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know what documents you have to present. Each document will have to be considered on its merits.

GENERAL VASILIEV: In this case, your Honor,
I ask the Tribunal to take judicial notice of the fact
that in that particular case the war was declared by
Japan after two or three days after the commencement
of military operations.

THE PRESIDENT: You could refer to that in your summation subject to any objection that may be taken there. Matters of which you take judicial notice do not permit of an enswer. The very statement implies that. If a matter is judicially noticed it is unanswerable.

GENERAL VASILIEV: But, you Honor, some specific documents relating to that period were accepted from the defense. The Tribunal will remember that Mr. President admitting inevidence defense documents stated that the Tribunal reserved the right to decide later on whether these documents are relevant to the issues in this case or not and to strike them out. I refer to pages 17,293, 17,306 of the transcripts.

THE PRESIDENT: At present, a majority of the Court think that this particular matter is irrelevant.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If I understood you correctly, Mr. President, the Tribunal means that all the documents offered by the defense relating to that period will be disregarded by the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: If they are intended to establish something which is contrary to what we would judicially notice they will be disregarded. That is all I can say.

Wolf & Yelden

GENERAL VASILIEV: I am going to offer now a small group of documents relating to the period of the Japanese intervention in Siberia. We are offering these documents to show that the intervention was undertaken by Japan for the seizure of territories and was accompanied by provocative actions, atrocities and outrages against the Russian population.

Prior to this time the prosecution has not introduced any documents relating to the period of the Japanese intervention. But the defense introduced a lengthy statement made by Baron SHIDEHARA at the Washington Conference in which SHIDEHARA contended that Japan's actions in Siberia had not been in pursuance of any territorial designs but had been directed towards the establishment of order without interference with the internal affairs of Russia. (Record, page 17423-32).

To reply to and to refute this defense document (exhibit 2319) and to provide the Tribunal with a correct and objective picture of the actual state of affairs we introduce a few documents which establish facts from original sources.

I respectfully ask to keep in mind that the prosecution stated at the time of the introduction of SHIDEHARA's speech that if the speech was admitted, the

•

•

prosecution would be compelled to introduce their own evidence on this issue. (Record, page 17420 of the transcript).

SHIDEFARA's speech was admitted in evidence.

This provides us with the right to introduce our documents.

I offer for identification as my first document IPS document No. 3098, the book entitled "America's Siberian Adventure" by Major General Graves of the United States Army, and excerpts therefrom in evidence.

General Graves was an eye witness of the events, being commanding officer of a unit of American forces in Siberia. There are no reasons to doubt his objectivity. General Graves corroborated that Japan undertook the intervention for the purpose of seizing the Maritime Province and Siberia, that the Japanese forces were provoking military clashes and committed innumerable crimes against the Russian people.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: We object to the introduction of this line of testimony on general grounds and to the introduction of this first document on particular grounds.

-

I am not familiar with Baron SHIDEHARA's speech. I believe it must have contained other things which made the speech relevant to the issues in this case. The only mention that I remember of this expedition by the prosecution was in Minister Golunsky's opening statement which, of course, is not evidence, and in the Semeonoff affidavit which the Court has said it would disregard.

- 17

The SI IDEHARA speech was apparently meeting an allegation of Golunsky. It is not concerned with any time covered by the Indictment nor any issue before this Tribunal. It is remote, immaterial, irrelevant and unimportant. If it is admitted we will have to submit evidence in surrebuttal in volume.

As to the particular document offered, it is submitted that General Graves could not know the intention of the Japanese. It is further submitted that this particular document is filled with conclusions and opinion, hearsay, without identifying the source.

I call attention to certain examples of this:

Out page 1, second paragraph: "In the light of subsequel? knowledge of the actual situation west of

Irkutsk, the only legical inference from General

OTANI's statement is that * * *."

Start where it says, "Page 63-64," on the first page, he says: "I was informed."

Later on, about ten lines down, he said: "I had previously been informed"; no identification of source.

Later on in that first paragraph about six lines from the bottom, he says: "There was no military situation demanding this increase."

On the third line from the bottom, he says:
"I have excellent reasons for stating * * *." He does
not state the reasons.

Page 2, he comes to the conclusion that Semyonov was "a murderer, robber and a most dissolute scoundrel."

Again on page 3, he said: "It was my judgment when in Siberia."

On page 2 under the excerpt "Page 107-108," he says: "Japan asked the Allies to permit her alone to take the Chinese Eastern and Amur railroads." If such request was made it must have been in writing. This is secondary evidence; no accounting is made for the original.

I don't think I need to say anything more about this particular document nor about the general run of the documents offered.

4

3

1

7

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, I believe there is no need to add anything concerning the relevancy of these documents. The defense, having been the first to introduce a document pertaining to the period of intervention, i.e. SHIDEHARA's speech, now contradicts itself, contending that documents of that period are irrelevant.

THE PRESIDENT: One Member of the Tribunal has asked why the defense are relying on SHIDEHARA's speech and at the same time resisting this document. However, by a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, as
I am going to tender quite a few documents I would like
to make a short statement to the Court about the tender
of these documents -- about the order of tendering
these documents. I was not able to reply to the objection by the defense. I only began to give reply to the
objection of the defense and I couldn't finish my reply
and then the decision of the Tribunal was already taken.
I don't know that the Tribunal treated any other prosecutor in that way.

THE PRESIDENT: I refer you to the transcript, General Vasiliev. I have no more to say.

Read to General Vasiliev what he said before

4 5

I gave the decision.

(Whereupon, the official court reporter read as follows:)

"GENERAL VASILIEV: I believe there is no need to add anything concerning the relevancy of these decuments. The defense, having been the first to introduce a document pertaining to the period of intervention, i.e. SHIDEHARA's speech, now contradicts itself, contending that documents of that period are irrelevant."

THE PRESIDENT: I have nothing to add to the words I stress.

GENERAL VALILIEV: It evidently refers to the translation. Evidently the translation was not quite correct.

If the Court please, I wanted to refer to the following circumstances which I consider to be very important as far as the introduction of these documents is concerned.

THE PRESIDENT: You mean the document already rejected.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Does it concern only the document I offered, your Honor, or does it refer to other documents as well? I was going to speak about other documents belonging to the same group.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. You may, of course, refer to documents not yet tendered. We will hear you fully on those.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Next I offer IPS document
No. 3091, a book by Colonel John Ward, for identification
and an excerpt therefrom in evidence. The author of
the book was Commander of a detachment of British
troops in Siberia and was an eye-witness of the conduct
of the Japanese forces and of their outrageous treatment of the Russian population.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I wish to object to the reception

3

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

21

22

of this document. It standsprecise on the same footing, I submit, as the previous document, being an excerpt from an account by another Allied officer commanding in Siberia; an officer, who, by the way, as it chances, was by way of being a rival of General Graves and whose conclusions, as set forth in the complete document from which this is excerpted, are often diametrically opposed.

This document, however, has this much in common with General Grave's: that it is packed with his conclusions, with broad generalities and with opinion. The opening sentence of this excerpt, is, I think, a good example of the entirety, the author boldly plunging in to tell us that the Japanese for their own peculiar reasons had decided, and so on, and so on.

This document recites a number of interesting and perhaps from the point of view of some Japanese troops discreditable but nevertheless wholly trivial and immaterial incidents. So that wholly aside from the general question of the retevence or the importance of the Siberian Expedition of 1919 and subsequent years, this document, I submit, can have no probative value and has no importance toward proving any of the issues in this litigation.

On the general question, of course, I submit that the ruling of the Tribunal just given on the previous document will dispose of this and those to follow on the same subject.

as I am able to learn, there has been no compliance with the rule requiring the desposit of these documents seven days in advance for the introduction of excerpts and we shall have to take objection on that ground because, should these be admitted, we shall require an opportunity to read the entire book in order to consider whether counterexcerpts should be tendered.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

23

24

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I have here before me'the decision of the Tribunal in accordance with which we were allowed to present the excerpts. We have always complied with any rulings of the Tribunal and it seems Mr. Blakeney is not aware of that.

When the documents were being admitted, in connection with the objection raised by the prosecution the President of the Tribunal said: "It may be that this evidence will justify evidence in rebuttal if it can be given...", page 17,422 of the transcript.

In our submission, this is all we wish to remind the

Court of; that this is exactly what we are doing. We are presenting the documents in rebuttal.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, I offer IPS document No. 3335, being the record of court proceedings held in connection with the annihilation of the village of Ivenovka and the shooting of its inhabitants by the Japanese troops in 1919.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MP. FURNESS: The defense objects to the admission of this document. It involves the destruction apparently of a village in 1919 at a time when a state of war or what was equivalent to a state of war existed between Communist Russia on one hand and the United States, Great Britain, France, Japan and other nations, I think, on the other hand.

It is remote in time, not covered by the Indictment and it is immaterial, irrelevant and then unimportant in so far as the issues of this case are concerned. It is furthermore, we submit, not competent under the rules of this Tribunal even if it involved an issue concerned in this case.

I call attention to the fact that it is apparently ex parte. The last paragraph on page 1 says "...I hereby request that the above-mentioned eye-witnesses be interrogated to secure the evidence without calling the other party."

Again on page 2, first paragraph, it appears that it is made on an application for the production of evidence by an attorney representing the village and was heard at an open session in a lawsuit brought by the above-mentioned community against the Japanese Government to repay 50 million roubles for the damage caused. So far as I know, no such lawsuit was ever binught and certainly this is no evidence that it was brought.

We submit that it is unimportant and has no protative value so far as any issues in this case are concerned.

W hallen

My contention about the relevancy of the document to the issues involved in the case. This document is just as 1 levant to the issues as the documents previously offered by the defense. As far as the probative value of this document is concerned, I should say that that is true that the document probably is not stylistically excellent, but we must say that this document is a piece of life taken from the original document, and, stylistically, this cannot be as excellent as Baron SHIDEHALA's speech, but it is a piece of life taken from the original document.

THE PRESIDENT: By a major ty the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The rejection of prosecution evidence relating to the period of the Japanese
intervention in Siberia brings about an absolutely
abnormal situation; this important historic fact
has been presented to the Tribunal in a one-sided and
distorted way, as the Tribunal have at their disposal
only defense documents.

It can be explained only by that that this period is now considered irrelevant to the issues in the case. I request you to remember that when receiving

in evidence defense documents dealing with matters beyond the scope of the Indictment Mr. P esident repeatedly pointed out that if it was found out that the documents were irrelevant they would be disregarded, record pages 17,293, 17,344, 17,306, 17,357, 17,360 of the transcript.

I believe that now it will be most proper to move that defense document, exhibit 2319, SHIDEHARA's speech at the Washington Conference, be disregarded. Then there will be no need for us to introduce our documents pertaining to this period, and justice will be restored.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If that constitutes a motion I think I should say this much, that the only contention which the defense has ever made is that matters relating to the Siberian Expedition and that period should be considered irrelevant by this Tribunal, and a fortiori that the period of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 or 1905 is irrelevant here.

Inasmuch, however, as I am not informed in detail concerning the SHIDEHARA speech which may contain other matters, I suggest that any such motion be noticed in the usual way so that counsel who are familiar with the matter may make any response which they

2 3 4

desire.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I request that -- I respectful-

THE PRESIDENT: I want to be clear about this,

General. I don't suppose you will be satisfied to be
told that we will disregard irrelevant matters. What
you want to know is whether or not we disregard those
matters tendered by the defense to which you refer so
that you may know what to do in your summation?

GENERAL VASILIEV: Yes, your Honor. I am afraid only of one thing, that when the Tribunal considers this important historic issue that the Tribunal will have at their disposal only one document offered by the defense which distorts the facts.

THE PRESIDENT: It is said by Major Blakeney that the SHIDEHARA document tendered by them relates to the Washington Conference which is an entirely different matter, of course.

GENERAL VASILIEV: But your Honor, in that speech made by Baron SHIDEHARA he also spoke about the Japanese intervention, the so-called Japanese intervention in Siberia in detail, trying to show that intervention in the way in which it never really occurred. Our people remember that historic episode as the gross violation of the rights of our people, and we want the

7 8

Tribunal to have a correct picture of that important historic event. Let the defense withdraw SHIDEHARA's speech, then there will be no need for me to offer any documents in rebuttal.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it is hard for us to recall instantly any one of 3,800 documents. I think we will have to look into these documents to see what they are about.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Yes, your Honor, I agree with that.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we will recess then. We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Duda & Spratt

MARSHAL OF THE COUNT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

of SHIDEHARA, and it appears to be what he called a concise statement with regard to Japanese aims and intentions in Siberia, and it certainly is all about Siberia. Its admission was fully debated, and I had quite a lot to say on behalf of the Tribunal; and we shall have to seriously consider whether our decision this morning is consistent with that given in relation to this speech of SHIDEHARA. It may be that we will be able to say that so much of the speech is relevant and so much irrelevant, but for the time being I cannot see that.

The Tribunal will look into the matter.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If your Honor please, in defense document No. 2319, pages 17,430 to 17,431 of the transcript, there is a contention that the so-called Nikolaevsk Incident, that is to say, the armed clash as a result of which both sides suffered losses and which served as a pretext for the Japanese to occupy the Soviet part of Sakhalin occurred through the foult of the Russians.

Besides, the defense offered the Soviet note of January 20, 1925, containing an expression of regret

concerning that incident for the purpose of proving that allegedly the Soviet side admitted its guilt with regard to this incident. Exhibit No. 2311, pages 17,357-58 of the transcript.

To rebut this evidence of the defense we offer in evidence prosecution's documents No. 3152, a telegram of March 3, 1920, No. 3153, an excerpt from the Journal of Battle Actions of 1920, and No. 3155, a telegram from Nikolaevsk of March 24, 1920. These documents show that the Nikolaevsk Incident was provoked by the Japanese troops.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

AR. BLAKENEY: I am afraid I didn't catch exactly which documents are being offered.

THE PRESIDENT: 3152.

MR. BLAUENEY: Only?

THE PRESIDENT: And he referred to exhibit 2311. At least, I have been handed No. 3152; I know nothing about 3153.

MR. BLAKENEY: Well, I suppose in any event we will consider them seriatin; so I will take up 3152 first.

In objecting to the tender of this document,
I wish to make the general objection that all matters
relative to this phase of the Siberian expedition are

3 4

1

5

7 8

9

10

11

12

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

irrelevant under the ruling of the Tribunal already given. This is the first of a considerable number of documents on the order of proof treating of the Nikolaevsk situation. That may or may not -- I don't know -- have some connection with the notorious massacre just referred to by General Vasiliev. Here, at all events, we have a telegram from some Red Army commander in Nikolaevsk to I don't quite know whom, concerning events in that city. This one contains the terms of a truce made at one stage of the fighting there. It speaks also of atrocities, imputing them to the Japanese. It then concludes with the statement that an investigation is being made of these atrocities. The probative value of the document, therefore, I submit, is considerably impaired, it being obviously statements of conclusions, and the importance of it, under the ruling of the Tribunal regarding the Siberian expedition, I think is nonexistent, and it should be rejected.

justify the acceptance by us of SHIDEHARA's speech,
Major Blakeney, but if you would like to try to distinguish between these documents this morning and that
speech, we will be glad to have your assistance.

MR. BLAKENEY: My view, your Honor, as one

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

familiar with the case in general but not with the details of that precise document, is this:

That document, I think I am quite safe in saying, was offered in evidence only to meet the possibility of findings by the Tribunal based upon portions of the evidence introduced and of the openings made by the Soviet prosecution concerning which we had not been able to get rulings of what we considered sufficiently desirable definiteness to limit the introduction of evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: That is because the Tribunal is not prepared to deal with the Indictment peacemeal.

MR. BLAKENEY: Now, I believe that by a simple example I can make this quite clear to the satisfaction of all concerned so that the matter can be dealt with.

In the early stages of the Seviet prosecution's presentation of evidence, the Tribunal accepted the affidavit of the witness Semyonov, which, of cours; was subsequently stricken out; but that is another matter. It was in evidence at that time. That affidavit centained approximately six pages of matter dealing with the Siberian expedition and other times prior to 1928, the commencement date of the Indictment herein; and specific objection was made on that ground at page 7,313 of the record. The affidavit was admitted without specific ruling on that point; and, therefore, we of the defense felt -- I think properly -that we did not know whether we were compelled to meet that evidence. We now know, I think, that we are not compelled to; and, therefore, the personal view which I originally said that I would proffer in answer to your Honor's question is that all evidence on that point, whether emanating from the prosecution or from the defense should no longer be taken into account in any way whatsoever.

THE PRESIDENT: It is not possible, I'should

3

1

5

7 8

9

11

12 13

14

16

17 18

19

21

22

24

1

say, or not practicable for me to take the views of the majority of the Judges or of all the Judges on each ground upon which an objection is based, and there are sometimes several grounds. All I can get, of course, is the question whether the document is admissible or not answered.

GENERAL VASILIEV: May I say a few words, your Honor. If the Court please, if I were asked a question about the difference between Baron SHIDEHARA's speech and the documents which we are offering, I would have said as follows:

Baron SHIDEHARA, in his speech at the Washington Conference, tried to justify the actions of the Japanese Government, at which was hurled an accusation that Japan was interfering in the internal affairs of Russia for the purpose of seizing Russian territories.

THE PRESIDENT: You need not say any more, General Vasiliev. We are unanimously of the opinion that exhibit 2319 is not of sufficient importance to require rebuttal. In the light of all that has happened in the meantime, we are able to come to that conclusion.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I will request that the Tribunal take the same view of exhibit No. 2311, and

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

in that case I will be fully satisfied. Both documents cover the same reriod. In such a case, it will not be necessary for me to offer these documents. I am of the opinion that it will be quite just to do that -- a fair decision.

THE PRESIDENT: We are all agreed.

offer prosecution's document No. 1952, excerpts from the minutes of the trial held on August 31 and on September 1, 1935, in Irkutsk by the Assizes of the military collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. and the full text of the judgment and sentence in the case of Kobylkin, Pereladov and Oleinikov. This document shows that the Japanese authorities conducted subversive activities against the U.S.S.R., drawing into them Russian whiteguards.

I must say that this document was offered earlier in the Russian phase and was objected to by the defense on the ground that we had only excerpts, but no full text of the record of the proceedings to serve on the defense. Therefore, the tender of the document was postponed till a later date (page 7749 of the transcript).

We received the full text of the document from Moscow only after the completion of the

7 8

prosecution's case and offer the document now.

This document refutes the contention of the accused and their witnesses to the effect that the subversive activities against the U.S.S.R. were not conducted, and thus, in our submission, its tender is proper at this stage.

The evidence offered by the defense which this document rebuts is at page 7749 of the transcript.

I shall read only the judgment stating the facts.

Please strike out "page 7749 of the transcript" and insert "pages 19,940 and 22,104 of the transcript in exhibit 2670."

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, might we inquire whether or not one of the Members of this Tribunal from which this excerpt, it appears from the heading, is taken, is the Russian Judge on this Tribunal -- International Tribunal?

It reads: "Members of the Court: comrades
Zaryanov and Serpuhevitin."

GENERAL VASILIEV: *, far as I know, yes,

MR. FURNESS: Then we object to it on that ground, and on several other grounds, and call attention

to the fact that this appears from its heading an excerpt, and that the original on file with the Clerk is apparently exactly the same document which was offered and rejected. There is nothing to show that the men here tried were represented by counsel, and nothing to show that there was any cross-examination.

to the fact that this appears from its heading an excerpt, and that the original on file with the Clerk is apparently exactly the same document which was offered and rejected. There is nothing to show that the men here tried were represented by counsel, and nothing to show that there was any cross-examination.

Greenberg & Lefler

There is nothing to show that the trial or its sentence and its findings were subject to any review. I wish to state that except at the very end there is no reference to Japan or Japanese, and there is reference only to a certain power. I submit there is no indication that this was a fair trial in which the sentence and the findings can be submitted to this Tribunal. Although these men were apparently, from their names, Russian by blood, there is no indication that they held Russian citizenship. There is no connection, from this document or from any other proof that I recall, with any accused here on trial.

Finally, I call attention to the fact that the sentence rendered is apparently not by the same Court that made the findings. Except for the President of the Court there are different names.

objection of defense counsel, mr. Furness, is on eighty per cent or more based on misunderstanding. Evidently Mr. Furness has not examined the document thoroughly. Everything is quite clearly stated in the document. It was an open Court session. An examination of all those participating in the trial took place and it was properly recorded in conformity with the procedural rules which are accepted in our

country. Defense counsel also participated in that trial, and their names are given in the document.

I don't think it is necessary to waste the time of the Tribunal on the contents of that document. It is only necessary to read the document. Correction:

It is not necessary to waste the time of the Tribunal enumerating everything that is stated in the document. It is enough to read the document itself.

As far as the connection with the accused in this trial is concerned, I should say that we are establishing the facts and these facts will show the relevancy of the matter to the accused. In our submission, this document is quite admissible, and it is in conformity with the rulings of the Tribunal.

wish to state that I was quite wrong in stating that they were not represented by defense counsel. It is apparent that they were. I wish to say that I did not intend to mislead the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 1952, being entitled "The Minutes of the Trial," will receive exhibit 3851 for identification only; and

the excerpt therefrom, being prosecution document 1952, will receive exhibit No. 3851A.

(Whereupon, the parent document was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3851 for identification; and the excerpt therefrom, document 1952, was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3851A and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: In order to save time, I consider it possible to read only the part of the udgment stating the fact. (Reading)

The Assizes of the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR "by investigation established that in 1935 the white guards I. V. Kobylkin 14 and E. O. Pereladov, having secretly penetrated into 15 the Soviet Union territory through Manchuria with the 16 aim of carrying out espionage, sabotage and terrorist acts, were respectively apprehended at various dates 18 in the East Siberian Region, having arms, incendiary cartridges and counter-revolutionary literature on them.

"Later on at the end of May, 1935, Victor Oleinikov was apprehended in the Zabaikalye while crossing the frontier. He, too, had secretly penetrated into the Soviet territory together with two other terrorists: Michail Oleinikov and Kustov who

24

20

21

22

3

11

were shot when attacking a border guard post. Revolvers, poisons, and counter-revolutionary literature were found on the shot men and on Victor Oleinikov as well.

"It is established by the documents of the case and by the confession of the defendants that Kobylkin and Pereladov who turned out to be a white-guard colonel and a white guard sub-lieutenant, respectively, living in emigration in Northern manchuria since the rout of the white bands in the Soviet Far East in 1922 until 1935, and being members of various whiteguard counter-revolutionary organizations took an active part in their activities in preparing an armed attack on the Soviet Union with the aim of overthrowing the Soviet Power and of restoring of capitalism with the help of foreign intervention.

"Having counter-revolutionary convictions and pursuing these aims of his own free will as one of the chiefs of the Eastern Department of the 'Russian General military Union,' Kobylkin also received and obeyed instructions of the Secret Service officers of a certain foreign power, being its secret agent. Besides, Kobylkin holding an official position in the police, helped and personally organized the snuggling of armed bands, weapons and individual agents from

Manchuria to the Sovict territory to carry out espionage, and sabotages and terrorist acts.

"So, during the time when Kobylkin worked as a police supervisor at the station of Djalainor, five armed bands were smuggled from Manchuria to the Soviet territory.

"In January, 1935, Kobylkin, following instructions of secretary of the military mission of a certain power in Kharbin, with the knowledge of the head of the military mission of the same power in the town of manchuria, smuggled to the Soviet Union territory the whiteguard Pereladov with the task of carrying out espionage, sabotage and terrorist acts.

"Pursuing the same counter-revolutionary aims and following the instructions of the already mentioned secretary of the military mission in Kharbin, Kobylkin himself, with the help of the head of the military mission in the town of Manchuria, crossed the Soviet frontier line with weapons on him in March, 1935, but was held up. There were on him two 'mauser' and one 'Astra' pistols, a large quantity of counter-revolutionary literature, and incendiary cartridges to be used for setting on fire stores and constructions of military importance.

"In the organizations of the transfer of

agents of the secret service of a certain power and of representatives of counter-revolutionary organizations into the Soviet territory, and in transportation of weapons and receiving espionage information, Kobylkin was assisted by Victor Oleinikov, who, since 1933 had maintained through General Shilnikov close contact with the military mission of a certain power in Kharbin.

When General Shilnikov who being chief of the Eastern Department of the Russian General military Union had simultaneously been a secret agent of the said military mission in Kharbin, died in 1934 the direction of the activities of the whiteguard organization of the 'Russian General military Union' passed on to Kobylkin, and Victor Oleinikov received his instructions, both from Kobylkin and from the secretary of the military mission in Kharbin, directly, and from the heads of the military missions in the towns of manchuria and mailar.

"With the help of Victor Oleinikov, who had repeatedly crossed the frontier himself and smuggled Pereladov, Kustov, Michail Oleinikov and even Kobylkin himself, the latter transferred onto the Soviet Territory 12 pistols with a large supply of rounds for committing terrorists acts, ten incendiary cartridges

.

.7

for sabotage acts, a camera with films for espionage work and poisons; strychnine and atropine, for the same terrorist acts.

fession and which is confirmed by Peredov's and Oleinikov's evidence, got all these things, intended for carrying out espionage, sabotage and terroristic tasks on the Soviet Union territory, from official representatives of the Military mission of a certain power in the towns of Kharbin and manchuria directly or through the head of the ditorial office of the newspaper 'Kharbinskoya Vremya.'

"The same persons gave Kobylkin money for carrying on counter-revolutionary sabotage work."

1

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I invite the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that it is clear from the explanations given by the accused Kobylkin at the closed session when the term "a certain power" was used Japan was meant, and this is mentioned in the record of the proceedings.

I ask that the witness KANDA be called.

MASATANE KANDA, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY GENERAL VASILIEV:

- Q Your name, Mr. Witness?
- A KANDA, Masatane.
- Q What was your rank in the Japanese Army?
- A Lieutenant-General.

GENERAL VASILIEV: May the witness be shown prosecution document 3087?

(Whereupon, a document was

handed to the witness.)

- Q Please examine the document and tell us whether it is your affidavit.
 - A This is my affidavit.
- Q Are the contents of the affidavit true and correct?

\$

5

.

A Yes.

Q Have you given your testimony without any duress?

A No.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The prosecution offered the Japanese document entitled "Research Materials for Sabotage Activities against Russia." The author of that document was KANDA, Masatane. The document was admitted in its entirety for identification, exhibit No. 698, and one half identified by the witness KASAHARA was received in evidence, exhibit No. 697. The defense objected to the admission in evidence of the other half of the plan, doubting its authenticity, record page 7,622 of the transcript.

We have found Lieutenant-General of the Japanese Army KANDA, Masatane, the author of the plan, and
he fully confirmed this document, making an appropriate
inscription on the original, exhibit No. 698. I respectfully ask Mr. President to examine the inscription. The
document is filed with the General Secretary of the Tribunal.

The witness KANDA states in his affidavit that he sent the whole text of the document to the General Staff to Major KASAHARA.

We offer in evidence prosecution document No.

3087, the affidavit of KANDA, Masatane.

No.")

THE MONITOR: Will the reporter read the question before the witness said, "No"?

(Whereupon, the official court reporter read as follows: "Q Have you give given your testimony without any duress?

THE INTERPRETER: That should be corrected, so that he made his affidavit without duress.

THE MONITOR: "No" should be replaced by "As you say."

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to the reception of this affidavit in evidence. The entire matter herein related refers to a period prior to 1928, the commencement date of the Indictment herein. The chief matter of the testimony seems to be the identification of a document of which the witness purports to recite the contents. However, it now appears from counsel's introductory statement that this document is already in evidence as exhibit 697 or 8, I couldn't quite catch which.

THE PRESIDENT: 698.

MR. BLAKENEY: He states, however, that only part of the document was received in evidence. The

4

6

1

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

document, in any event, must be immaterial, relating as it does to a period prior to the Indictment.

And even if the reason for the Tribunal's nonacceptance of the other half of the document was, concerning which I haven't the faintest memory, that it was not sufficiently identified, the document itself still remains immaterial and unimportant for present purposes.

What I do well remember is that the witness KASAHARA, mentioned herein, conceded that he had been engaged in intelligence concerning Soviet forces, that he had prepared reports thereon, and had seen other reports, all of which, I submit, amounts to nothing more than what the Tribunal knows, that all armies conduct intelligence, in view of which I suggest also the rejection of this document as having no probative value against any of the issues in the case.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, when we presented the document last year, I should say in 1946, the defense raised the same objection to the introduction of that document, saying that the document was irrelevant as it related to the period prior to the period covered by the Indictment. At that tirt, the Tribunal rejected the objections raised by the defense as the document contained a plan for several years to

2 . 3

5

8

10

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22 23

24

come, and one half of that document was received in evidence. And it is quite natural that now we are offering the second half; it naturally follows, one from the other.

And we offer this document in evidence now, the second half of the document.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

MR. FURNESS: We assume, your Honor, that that applies only to the affidavit which this witness --

THE PRESIDENT: The document last tendered is the affidavit. I am not readmitting exhibit No. 698. There is no need to do that. I am speaking of the affidavit.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3087 will receive exhibit No. 3852.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3852 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: Your Honor, we have only two minutes left. Probably it would be better to read the affidavit after the recess.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half past one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

1330.

Kappleau & Duda

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The accused ARAKI is now present.

General Vasiliev.

MASATANE KANDA, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall now read the affidavit of the witness KANDA, Masatane, omitting the formal parts.

"From April 1924 to April 1925, I served in the Fourth Division of the Second Section of the Japanese General Staff Office.

"In April 1925, I was transferred to the Headquarters of the Kwantung Army on the recommendation of the Chief of the Second Section of the Japanese General Staff Office in order to aid in the business

to

•

of collecting material at the Harbin Intelligence Office on the military topography of North Manchuria and the U.S.S.R.

"At the same time, getting the permission of the Chief of the Second Section, I was to investigate methods /of drawing up/ an anti-Soviet subversive plan at the Harbin Intelligence Service Office.

"I was in the Harbin Intelligence Service from April 1925 until December 1927 and studied the problems of strategic activity against Soviet Russia.

"I wrote a report on the study of methods of strategy against Soviet Russia at the end of 1927 while I was a member of the Harbin Intelligence Service. At the end of 1927, I sent the report to Colonel KAWAMOTO, /officer/ in charge of intelligence of Kwantung Army Headquarters and the full text of the same document as secret documents direct to Major KASAHARA, Chief of the Russian Department of the Second Section of the General Staff, whose function was handling Russian problems. The reason I sent this report was that I wished to inform Kwantung Army Headquarters and the quarters concerned in the General Staff of all the problems stated in it.

"I hereby affirm with confidence that the document entitled 'Research Materials for a Strategic

2

5

7 8

9

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

Plan Towards Russia' which has just been presented to me is a photographic copy consisting of 50 pages and that it is really the whole text of the secret document which I had drawn up in 1927 and sent to Colonel KAWAMOTO, /officer/ in charge of intelligence of Kwantung Army Headquarters and also to Major KASAHARA, Chief of the Russian Department of the Second Section of the General Staff Office.

"The document presented consists of six items and additional remarks:

"1. The outline of a strategic plan towards Russia.

"2. Summary of an espionage plan which is to be carried out in Siberia and points east.

"3. Agencies which are to be established for the purpose of carrying out the strategic plan in Siberia and eastwards and their activities.

"4. That part of the strategic plan relating to the means of communications in North China.

"5. That part of the strategic plan connected with the collection of resources in North China.

"6. A collection of reference materials.

"Appendix: Peace-time establishments
necessary in the Far East for the strategic plan covering Russia.

11

9

10

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

38,241

"To certify the above-mentioned facts, I hereby sign and date the back of each page of the document I have confirmed.

"This affidavit was drawn up in my own hand and is at no variance with the facts in every particular."

Signed, "Masatane KANDA."

May the witness be shown exhibit No. 698?
BY GENERAL VASILIEV:

Q Please examine this document and tell us whether you identify this document as your report.

A Yes, this is.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer this document in evidence. It was received for identification as exhibit No. 698. The first three chapters of this document were received in evidence and have exhibit No. 697.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If your Honor please, we object to the reception of this document in evidence on the ground that it is not on the prosecution's order of proof. We have had no notice it was to be offered.

I believe that I am correct in stating that exhibit 697 was the affidavit of a man named KASAHARA, and that the document which your Honor apparently now

4

1

2

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

chapters.

has in his hands was not marked for identification,
but the first three chapters were received in evidence.
The first three chapters were identified by KASAHARA.
He did not identify the remainder of the document;
and, therefore, the Court received only the first three

As I stated, we had no notice in the order of proof that the remainder of the document was going to be offered, and we therefore object to its being received.

THE PRESIDENT: This is a pertinent observation, if I may say so, from a colleague: "They" -- meaning you -- "must be familiar with it, as they successfully excluded part of it previously."

MR. FURNESS: I should like to call attention to the fact that the exhibit which has just been received into evidence and read does not refer to this document in a way that we could identify it. So that we could have identified it, it would have been a simple matter to put it on the order of proof.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, this document in its entirety was processed and served on the defense. That was about a year and a half ago -- to be exact, in October, 1946. This document is not on our order of proof because this document is

mentioned in the afficavit of this witness, and the affidavit has been drawn up specially for that purpose. Therefore, I think that we have not broken any rules of the Tribunal.

I request that in addition to document 698 -exhibit 698, which is the first half of the report,
the second half of the report be admitted in evidence
and given a proper exhibit number.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: The second half of the document beginning with part 4.

MR. FURNESS: If your Honor please, I should like to call attention to the fact that exhibit 3852 refers to document entitled "Research Materials for Strategic Plan towards Soviet Russia." Exhibit No. 698 has no title whatever.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness has identified it, though. The objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 2460, now exhibit 698 for identification only. Will be marked as received in evidence and will retain the same exhibit number.

(Whereupon, exhibit No. 698, previously marked for identification, was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I do not desire to read the document because the greater part of the document has already been read, and the titles of the chapters are already given i- the affidavit of the present witness. So to save time, I am not going to read the document.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev, the Judges are asking for copies of this document.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Your Honor, this document was processed in its entirety in October, 1946. If the need arises to do it again, I can offer to the Tribunal additional copies of it.

THE PRESIDENT: I have mine, but I understand some of the Judges have not theirs. However, we will consider what you have just said.

GENERAL VASILIEV: We will certainly check it up and serve additional copies if necessary.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The defense may crossexamine the witness if they so desire.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, we would like to reserve the right to cross-examine this witness until we have made another examination of the part of exhibit 698 which was int admitted into evidence. As I stated, we had no notice that the remainder of this document was to be offered. We have not made another study of it, and most of us, just like the Court, do not have it with us.

THE PRESIDENT: We think the witness ought to be stood down until the defense have an opportunity of

3

6

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

looking into the document. You will be ready tomorrow morning no doubt, Major Furness?

MR. FURNESS: Well, your Honor, we will try to get ready as quickly as we can.

THE PRESIDENT: ves. He will be stood down until tomorrow morning at 9:30.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, we offer in evidence a group of documents having prosecution's number 3334, proving the subversive activities of the Japanese agents on the Chinese Eastern railway conducted for the purpose of creating conditions which would compel the U.S.S.R. to sell the railway and influence favourably for Japan the terms of the payment.

In the course of his cross-examination the accused TOGO admitted that the Soviet Government made representations charging the Japanese-Manchurian authorities with illegal actions on the Chinese Eastern railway, record page 35,967.

Besides, these documents rebut the evidence of the defense containing the allegations that the sale of the railway was voluntary on the part of the U.S.S.R. and that Japanese agents committed no illegal actions on the railway, record pages 29,427, 29,429, 35,418, and 35,484.

On that ground it is proper to tender our documents at this stage.

3

1

6

8

9

11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

23

1. I first offer in evidence prosecution document No. 3334, a memorandum on the basic principles of the purchase of the Chinese Eastern Raffway submitted by the Soviet delegation at the meeting on July 3, 1933.

During the cross-examination of TOGO this document was admitted for identification, exhibit No. 3651.

To save time I shall read only the title and the first three items of Section 2.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: The question of alleged illegal actions by the Japanese, so extensively referred to by counsel, can be met when reached. They are not involved in this document. This document is a memorandum prepared by the Soviet delegation, apparently for the purpose of submission to the Manchukuo delegation at a meeting in connection with the negotiations for the sale of this railway. As is shown by its title and, more especially, by the title of the section headed "I," it is a discussion of the value of the railway. This document is the typical representation by a would-be seller made to induce the purchase of his property, and attempting to show it in the most favorable light possible, and for all I know, is perfectly accurate in all its

figures and statements in that regard. But such a document prepared for such a purpose, I submit, can be nothing more than a self-serving declaration of one of the parties to the transaction, and if it did contain matter tending to support any of the allegations of the prosecution in regard to this transaction, it would, I submit, have to be rejected as having no probative value and no importance, in view of its origin and purpose, and I therefore object to its reception.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, I wish to object to this document on behalf of Mr. HIROTA.

In our submission, details mentioned in this document have been amply covered by the KAMEYAMA affidavit, exhibit 3234, at record 29,426, and the final contract of sale concluded between the parties, exhibit 443-A, at record 5042.

There is another exhibit I invite the Tribunal's attention to, No. 3235-A, record 29,435. In our submission, this document is repetitive and does not add anything new. The whole matter was settled as between the parties by a valid contract, and congratulatory telegrams were exchanged as between the heads of the departments of the two governments handling the matter, which are exhibits 3251, at record 29,612, and a state-

21 22

ment was made by Mr. Litvinov upon the conclusion of the contract, exhibit 3252, at record 29,616.

In addition, if your Honors please, to being repetitive, I respectfully submit it adds nothing new to the case and is not intended to meet any proof submitted by the defense. Therefore it has no probative value and is unimportant and should be rejected.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you wish to add anything, General?

GENERAL VASILIEV: Yes, a few words, sir. That the document is relevant to the issues involved in this case was confirmed in the first part of Mr. Yamaoka's statement to the Court, that is, his reply to what Mr. Blakeney said on the subject that allegedly that document is not relevant, and all the rest is an argumentative matter which will be considered by the Tribunal while rendering the verdict -- is a matter-of argument.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms on my casting vote.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3334, now exhibit 3651 for identification only, will be marked as received in evidence and will retain the same exhibit number.

(Whereupon, exhibit No. 3651, previously marked for identification, was received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read the title of the document and part of Chapter 2:

"Memorandum on the basic principles of the purchase of the Chinese Eastern Railway by Manchoukuo

13 14

10

11

12

2

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

(submitted by the Soviet delegation at the meeting on July 3, 1933)."

I pass over to Section 2.

"II. The purchasing price and the methods of payment.

"1. In defining the purchasing price of the Chinese Eastern Railway and its property one should adhere to item 2, article 1 of the Mukden Agreement setting forth that the contracting parties in the course of the purchase will define the real value of the Chinese Eastern Railway and state that the railway should be purchased at a fair price.

"In conformity with this and taking into consideration the basic articles of the balance precisely establishing the real expenditures for the construction and development of the Chinese Eastern Railway the Soviet Government being guided at the same time by the principle of justice carefully considered all the circumstances enabling it to considerably cut down the purchasing price.

"2. The sum total of expenditures for the construction of the railway for the completion of the work left undore for the acquisition of the rolling stock, losses in the course of the utilization of the capital for the construction and for the payment of

interests in the course of the construction as well as expenditures in connection with improvement of the railway amounts to 411,691,976 golden roubles.

"This sum does not include 178,579,610 golden roubles lent by the former Tsarist Government to the Chinese Eastern Railway to make up deficits and to maintain the railway during the first years of its existence. The great indebtedness of the railway to the Government of the USSR due to the interests on the capital invested in the Chinese Eastern Railway and mentioned in the balance has likewise not been taken into consideration.

"Moreover, taking into consideration some wear of the technical equipment and some changes in the economic importance of the Chinese Eastern Railway in connection with the construction of new railways and trying to cut down the purchasing price as much as possible the Soviet Government agree to reduce the purchasing price of the Chinese Eastern Railway in conformity with the above-mentioned articles of the balance to 210 million golden roubles instead of actual expenditures amounting to 411,691,967 golden roubles.

"3. However, this sum (210 million golden roubles) does not include the cost of various property of the Chinese Eastern Railway which itself is of great

G

economic importance and the original cost of which has considerably increased due to the development of the Chinese Eastern Railway.

"It is common knowledge that the Railway is the owner of the large land property.

"In conformity with the Peiping and Mukden agreements the Soviet Government agreed to transfer the land which the railway does not need to the Chinese authorities. In 1925 upon the proposal of the Soviet Government the joint Soviet-Chinese commission for the delimitation of land was established. However, the Mukden authorities evaded convoking this commission preferring to unlawfully seize the land of the railway piecemeal.

"Without going into the details in establishing the cost of this land which should undoubtedly be left in the possession of the railway as well as the cost of the rich forest concession of the Chinese Eastern Railway which also are of great importance the Soviet Government agree to estimate all this property of the railway as amounting only to 40 million golden roubles which is considerably below its actual cost.

"In accordance with the above-mentioned, the total purchasing price of the Chinese Eastern Railway and of all its property is fixed 250 million golden

roubles. (210 million golden roubles plus 40 million golden roubles, 1 golden rouble is equal to 1.04 golden yer.)"

•

I next offer in evidence prosecution document No. 3334-E, a note of the Soviet Ambassador in Tokyo to the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs HIROTA dated July 22, 1934.

In the cross-examination of TOGO this document was admitted for identification and received exhibit No. 3650.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

evidence of this document on the following ground:
This communication, as is shown by the termination of
the fourth paragraph from the end thereof, is simply
a protest lodged by the Soviet authorities with the
Government of Japan, by all events, purports to be
a protest so lodged. I submit that the lodging of
the protest by one of the parties with the other is no
evidence of the occurrence of the incidents therein
referred to. And, in any event, this document is
certified to be a copy of the original in moscow
which I think makes it clear that the original was not
served upon the Japanese Government. I, therefore,
submit that it has neither probative value nor importance and should be rejected.

THE PRESIL WT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal, I

4 5

also wish to enter an objection on behalf of mr.

HIROTA. In addition to the reasons set forth by my
learned friend, Mr. Blakeney, I wish to state that
similar protests are already in evidence. They are
exhibit 748 at record 7,739 and exhibit 749.

1

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Tribunal will undoubtedly recall that whea this Chinese Eastern Railway question was first brought forth here the defense protested on the ground that the matter had been settled and that it should not be reopened. However, our objections were overruled and the evidence by the prosecution was admitted. Later on in the defense case we endeavored to submit documents dealing with this problem in order to meet the issue raised by the prosecution; and, particularly, I recall that during the presentation of Mr. HIROTA's case, when some of these documents came up before the Tribunal, the prosecution objected to their admission on the ground that they were not important, were repetitive, and contained nothing new. Then the question came up as to the exact purpos of the prosecution in bringing this matter into issue, and I beg to refer the Tribunal, if I may, to record 29,443 at which, in reply to an inquiry by the President, Mr. Carr stated, "There is no specific allegation about it in the Indictment, nor is it an important

part of the evidence of conspiracy, but it is only as evidence of conspiracy and preparation that it was introduced."

At the suggestion of the President that the clarification of Mr. Carr may obviate the necessity of tendering additional documents dealing with this subject, we, in the HINOTA case, did withdraw from our order of proof several documents dealing specifically with this question. Now, a slight modification was taken by Mr. Carr, as I recall it, your Honors please, but substantially the record remains in apposition and, consequently, in my respectful submission, these documents which are now supposed to be submitted here are repetitive, have no importance, and, if the example is followed in the case when the defense was presenting its case, these documents should be rejected.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vosiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Mr. Yamaoka referred to Mr. Comyns Carr, the prosecutor from the British Commonwealth of Nations, and Mr. Yamaoka relied more on his memory than his memory could have helped him.

THE PRESIDENT: I cannot hear a word of the translation. Repeat that, please.

(Whereupon, General Vasiliev's

statement was read by the official court reporter.)

his statement on that subject, and the defense continued the presentation of their evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: my line is out of order. Repeat what he said.

(Whereupon, General Vasiliev's last statement was read by the official court reporter.)

said is a matter of argument, and I do not think it is necessary to deal with this now. It is not proper to deal with this now. I understand that when the Pribunal marked the document for identification in the cross-examination of the accused TOGO, it decided the matter of probative value of the document and its relevancy to the issues involved in this case.

THE PRESIDENT: That is not so, General.

By a majority, the objections are sustained and the document rejected.

General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer in evidence prosecution document 3334-A, a report of the director of the railway from the USER to the board of directors

of the Chinese Eastern railway, dated August 7, 1934. I intend to read only the first page of the English text.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

of the Chinese Eastern railway, dated August 7, 1934.

I intend to read only the first page of
the English text.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

.

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, I wish to make the objections to this document that it can have no probative value, being only a report by someone denominated Director of the Chinese Eastern Railway to the Board of Directors of the same organization. This document, of course, might possibly prove to be some of the material upon the basis of which were made such protests as the one just excluded and others which have been received. If that be the position, I submit, it has no importance whatever.

On the question of probative value, however, I think we should notice also the following curious facts in connection with this document.

This is a long and I am afraid not too lucid dissertation on malicious actions and accidents in connection with the operations of the Chinese Eastern Railway. The only offer contained in the document to charge any blame for these malicious actions seems to place it on some entity known as the Meadquarters, which is referred to repeatedly and letters from whom are even quoted from in the text. And, parenthetically those letters should, of course, be produced rather than this second document reciting their contents. However, from a reading of the whole document it appears that this Headquarters is an organization policing the

25

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

railway zone and, therefore, presumably an organization either under the control of or closely allied with the railway which is operating within that zone.

Therefore, I submit that the only reasonable conclusion which can be drawn from a reading of this document is that in their private communications among themselves the railway was really complaining of these incidents as being all attributed to their headquarters or guard troops and, therefore, that the document has no probative value on any issue here involved.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Yamaoka.

MR. YAMAOKA: May it please the Tribunal,
I have an objection to this tender on behalf of
Mr. HIROTA, and at the same time beg to invite the
Tribunal's attention to exhibits 748 and 749, which I
have mentioned previously.

This proposed tender is merely repetitive.

Moreover, I wish to add it is my recollection that at the time in August, 1934, the railway guards along the Chinese Eastern Railway were not Japanese at all but were either Manchukucans or Russians, and I do not recall any evidence in the case tying up any of these alleged actions with the Japanese, and particularly the accused HIROTA. I therefore respectfully submit that the document should be rejected.

M o 1 r s 2 e 3 & 4 W 5 a 6 1 e 7 n 8

GENERAL VASILIEV: What Mr. Yamaoka has said is either a matter of argument, or Mr. Yamaoka takes upon himself the roll of a witness here and testifies what in his opinion was guarded and was not guarded on the railway. Correction: Who guarded the railway and who did not guard the railway.

In our submission this document is proper evidence and is quite admissible. And this document is in full conformity with all the rules laid down by the Tribunal. Among other documents this document will assist the Tribunal to have a full objective picture of what took place on the railway. Therefore, I offer this document in evidence and ask the Tribunal to receive it.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer in evidence prosecution's document No. 3334-F, a letter of the Consul-General of the U.S.S.R. in Harbin of April 19, 1934 with an attached list of Soviet citizens arrested by the Manchurian authorities.

I desire to read only the first four paragraphs at page 1.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney, did you conduct the Russian phase for the defense?

MR. BLAKENEY: It was conducted largely, if not wholly, by Mr. Furness and me.

I have objections to this document on several grounds. This is the first of a series of five documents of similar nature addressed to the two men mentioned herein, Mr. SHIMAMURA, who appears above the text, and Mr. Shi Lui-Ben, who appears in the first limb of the text.

The evidence already in the case, and I refer especially to the testimony of defendant TOGO as well as evidence on the current order of proof but not yet tendered, and especially document No. 3334-G, show that Mr. Shi Lui-Ben is an official of the Foreign Office of Manchukuo, and, therefore, Mr. Shi Mamuha is presumably likewise since the two are coupled in the first sentence of the document. These protests, then, addressed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Manchukuo, or rather to an Acting Special Commissioner thereof, would in no way tend to show the bringing home of notice either to the Japanese Government or to any of these defendants of the matters therein contained.

Additionally, the document now under consideration is objectionable, first, in that it contains a long list of persons alleged to have been arrested, as is stated herein, without the slightest legal grounds, and

is thus a mere conclusion.

7 8

The main body of the document is the story of some unfortunate individual who was subjected to acts of violence but, as appears from the second paragraph from the bottom of page 1, he was subjected to this violence by three persons apparently of Russian origin or nationality, these persons being identified as Rusev, Topyga and "some young Russian detective."

If we concede the truth of the allegations made against them it has no tendency to prove any crime, the commission of any crime by any Japanese or even the knowledge thereof and I, therefore, submit that this self-serving protest has neither probative value nor importance.

THE PRESIDENT: Have you any new matter, Mr. Yamaoka?

MR. YAMAOKA: No, if your Honors please. I just wish to enter an objection on grounds that I previously advanced for other documents.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: This document constitutes the facts which could not have been invented.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: Which actually took place.

GENERAL VASILIEV: This document has been taken from the archives and this document is, so to speak, a piece of life, and this document presents value

C

•

to the Tribunal.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: And this document was taken from the archives pertaining to that time.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer in evidence prosecution's document No. 3334-C, a letter of the Chief of the Consulate-General of the U.S.S.R. in Harbin dated August 21, 1934, with an attached list of arrested Soviet citizens.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney:

MR. BLAKENEY: I do not think it necessary to repeat the grounds of objection to this document which stands in precisely the same case as the one last tendered and rejected.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no additional feature.

MR. BLAKENEY: The only difference which might
be felt at all material but which I believe is not is
that this docvent states in so many words that the
acts complained of were committed by Manchurian police
authorities. I, therefore, object to its reception.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I ask the Tribunal to receive this document in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection

is sustained and the document rejected.

We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Duda & Spratt

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

MARSHIL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kraft.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captein Kraft): If the Tribunal please, the following language correction is submitted:

Record page 36,140, line 8: Delete "if I am not mistaken."

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, out of the remaining documents of this group, I think it necessary to offer only one document, that is No. 3334-G. This document as far as its form is concerned is in conformity with the rules of the Tribunal. Similar diplomatic documents were received by the Tribunal both from the defense and the prosecution in great numbers. This document sums up for a definite period what occurred on the Chinese Eastern Railway and the events which hampered the functioning of the railway to & great extent. The document states specific facts, names, dates, and also outlines the arrests, outrages, and inhuman treatment of various Soviet citizens. In our submission this document is relevant and material, and it will assist the Tribunal to have a full and objective picture of what actually

12

14

16 17

18

20

21

22

24

occurred on the Chinese Eastern Railway.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I take an objection to this document on substantually the same grounds as in the case of the last two tendered and rejected. The difference is primarily that rather than being a protest addressed to Shi Lui-ben this one is a summary of the correspondence between the Consulate-General of the U. S. S. R. and Shi Lui-ben; and I submit that it is another self-serving, argumentative document, having no relation to any of these defendants nor to the Government of Japan, and having therefore no probative value or importance.

THE PRESIDENT: What is the date of the protest, General?

The date does not appear; the date of the protest does not appear as far as we can see.

GENERAL VASILIEV: November 26, 1934.

THE PRESIDENT: 1934 does not appear in the document.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I beg the pardon of the Tribunal. This is a technical error. On the original document there is a date, November 26, 1934.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: On the original document

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is upheld and the document rejected.

General Vasiliev.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer the document No. 2329-B.

The Tribunal received from us for identification the book, "Great Manchurian Empire," published on accasion of the ten-year jubilee (exhibit No. 731) and an excerpt therefrom was received in evidence (exhibit No. 731-A).

We offer in evidence other excerpts from this book to rebut the evidence offered by the defense to the effect that the Concordia Society was not engaged in politics, that the Command of the Kwantung Army did not direct the activities of the society and that the society aimed only at the development of culture and cooperation among the nations. I refer to pages 19,227, 20,148-20,153 of the transcript.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, we object to the offer of this evidence. We believe it is repetitive, already covered in the original case. The only mention of any defendant in this document is the defendant UNEZU on the bottom of page 3, but

this only shows that he received a visiting prince, which I submit was part of his duties and in no way any evidence of any criminal activities. It does on page 5 mention what is known as the Nomonhan Incident, but this mention has no particular bearing on the case. It shows that certain volunteer detachments of this Concordia Society rendered great help in the defense of the dity of Hailar, and we submit that even the prosecution will addit that the City of Hailar is far in the intentor of danchukue. It either shows that in the course of this incident the Russian troops penetrated far beyond the border which even they claimed or it shows that this particular type of evidence is of no value. We submit, therefore, the document should be rejected.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

Kyo-Wa-Kai Society or the Concordia Society was very often mentioned in this Tribunal in the course of the presentation of the individual phases. This matter has bearing on several of the accused, and then it is important for the understanding of what was going on in Manchuria with the view of transforming it into a military base for an attack on the Soviet Union. In this book the Kyo-Wa-Kai Society or the Concordia

N.

C.

Society tells of its own activities, work it was engaged in. This certainly is of great importance, especially if we take into consideration that the membership of the Concordia Society amounted to several million people. And the Commanding General of the Kwantung Army was an honorary president of the society and daily directed its activities. Therefore, I ask the Tribunal to receive this document in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 2329-B will receive exhibit No. 3853.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3853 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

D.

GENERAL VASILIEV: If the Court please, to save time I am going to read only some of the excerpts from the book. The excerpts I am going to read are marked in the copies which have been served on the Tribunal.

"Page 177.

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"In connection with the commencement of Chinese events of July 7 (the 4th year of Kan-De) the Central Headquarters of the Kyo-Wa-Kai for the purpose of national mobilization of spirit sent to all provincial and district headquarters instructions as to the rousing of national spirit in masses of the population, propagation of economy, unselfish service, renovation of life, etc. Those instructions were strictly carried out in conformity with local conditions and that contributed to quieting the population and to conducting general state mobilization of spirit for the period in what the events would take place. One of such measures was having on first day of each mont's a day of service devoted to the Greater Asia for which purpose all members of local branches of the Concordia society assemble in shrines. Furthermore, all provincial and district headquarters of the Concordia society conducted organizational meetings

at which were explained the reasons for the outbreak of the Chinese incident.

"5th year of Kangte (1938).

"In connection with the commencement of Chinese events the Concordia Society headed the move-ment for collecting donations in the country for building aircraft for military purposes.

"In connection with the establishment of diplomatic relations with friendly European countries, Manchu-Di-Go on the initiative of the Concordia Society sent to those countries its official mission for strengthening friendship and economic relations with them as well as for establishing a common powerful anti-communist bloc. To the end of August of the 5th year of Kande there were 123 district and town Headquarters of the Concordia Society, 3000 branches with 1,000,000 active members.

"Page 179.

"The Concordia Society in Nomonghan events.

"We must separately deal with an important and responsible work of the Concordia Society in the period of 'Nomonghan events' called so after the name of the area in which they took place.

"Japan and Manchukuo in conformity with their treaty of friendship joined forces and came

forward to protect the frontiers of the state. The Concordia Society from the very commencement of the events took an active part in the defense of the state and established close relations with the government and its local organs.

"First of all the Concordia Society took measures to maintain peace within the country, to fight and prevent provocations and sabotage, and was especially active in the field of mobilization of the spirit of the population of the country and mainly in the Hailar district close to the scene of events.

"A special committee was formed by the Hailar authorities for this purpose. The Concordia Society undertook also propaganda and information activities.

"Volunteer detachments were organized under the direction of the Concordia Society; they rendered great nelp in the defense of the city, in the consolidation of the rear and in assisting the fighting army.

"The enlarged net of the Concordia Society consisted of 3,569 branches with 2,050,000 members in the whole country.

"On December 8, 1941, the Holy War for the Greater East Asia broke out. Following the Rescript

.

of His Majesty Tenno ceclaring war on the USA and Litain, His Majesty, the Emperor, graciously promulgated a Rescript about the support of the righteous cause of the kindred Nipponese Empire.

Chamber TAKEBE promulgated a declaration in the name of the Government in which it was stated that the people of the Empire must render every possible spiritual and Mysical help to Nippon which consisted of:

- "1) Strengthening of Spirit.
- "2) Inseparable ties between Manchoukuo and Nippon.
- "3) Strengthening of the joint defense of Nippon and Manchoukuo.
- manpower, materials and products.
- "5) % unified effort of sacrificial work of all groups of the ropulation.
- "6) Keeping secrecy, suppressing rumours and provocations.
- "7) Economizing staple products and controlling of supply.

"The star ment containing full support of the basic policies of the government was promulgated by the Central Headquarters of the Concordia Society

3

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

on the same day.

"The 9th year of Kangte (1942).

"The carrying out of defensive maneuvers and the strengthening of the personnel for defense were the principal items of the Concordia Society activities."

Page 10 of the English text:

tration and the Concordia Society the governors were appointed to the posts of chiefs of provincial head-quarters of the Concordia Society. Their deputies --vice-governors -- were appointed deputy chiefs of the headquarters. Similar measures were carried out with regard to district and town headquarters of the Concordia Society. In virtue of this reform in the hands of those who headed the administrative setup was concentrated the direction of the work of local branches of the Concordia Society. The part played by the chiefs of administrative bodies became more important. Along with that increased their responsibility for the work of the Concordia Society as its development fully depended on their attitude to their new duties.

"First of all it was necessary for them to do their work actively and to be actively guided by the spirit of the Concordia Society.

"Only under such conditions could they justify

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

the hopes of the Concordia Society and the government.

If those new chiefs had discharged their duties in
the Concordia Society only formally it would have been
a great mistake resulting in enermous consequences.

"In order to prevent the occurrence of such an event Mr. MIYAKE, chief of the Central Headquarters of the Concordin Society and commanding general of the Kwantung frmy repeatedly instructed new governors of provincial, district and town headquarters of the Kyo-Wa-Kai and pointed out that such errors should never happen."

Page 13:

"It is pointed out in the directive of General YEDA, commander-in-chief of the Kwantung Army that the Concordia Society sets itself the task of being a leading organ in carrying out state policy amidst the population. Besides, the Concordia Society considers it its duty to maintain order in the country while it carries out the state policy.

"Page 201.

"The 3d All-Manchurian Congress of the Concordin Society (1936).

"On the same July 25 (1936) in Hsinking, in the 'Da-Tung' Square a review and a ceremony were held on the occasion of the opening of a new branch

.

-

at the Centre and the creation of the Central Headquarters of the Concordia Society.

"Members of all branches of the Concordia Society attencing the All-Manchurian Congress in Hsinking, representatives of the Army and of 39 government departments, in total more than 30,000 people, participated therein.

"General UEDA, Commander of the Kwantung Army, General ITAGAKI, the Kwantung Army Chief of Staff, Admiral HAMADA, the Prime Minister, Marshal Chang King-hui and MATSUOKA, President of the South Manchurian Railroad, took the review.

"His Majesty's rescript addressed to the Concordia Society and directives of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army were read at the review.

"Thus, the 3d All-Manchurian Congress of the Concordia Society was held in a highly solemn atmosphere."

Page 18:

"The emergency period our country is living through sets responsible practical tasks before youth organizations. They amount to this: at present our youth along with the groun-up population must persistently move forward and overcome all the obstacles confronting our nation as well as East /siatic mations.

2

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

Bringing the holy East Asiatic war with the Anglo-Saxons to a victorious end and the creation of mutual co-prosperity of East Asiatic nations require that all strength be concentrated on that sacred cause.

"The government taking into consideration the importance of present tasks of Manchukuo conducts a policy aimed at solving these vital problems. It is trying to increase the amount of agricultural products and the extraction of natural resources by means of developing local branches of industry and to strengthen the defense of northern frontiers of the country.

"To the successful conduct of its policy the government took a decision to introduce general labor conscription in Manchukuo throughout the emergency per.od.

"Page 215.

"TANABE, Chief of the State Chamber, in his report on the general course of the government policy made at the All-Manchurian Congress of the Concordia Society pointed out as regards three foregoing tasks that in the openion of the Government their successful solution must be based on the sacrificial work for the state of all young people required to work in accordance with the labour conscription.

.12

"Public Volunteer detachments of the Concordia Society.

"A conference of representatives of military command, government and the Concordia Society was called in Hsinking on April 23, 1938, on the question of the establishment of mobilization organizations of the population which were to include youth as well as grown-up population.

"At subsequent meetings was fully worked out a plan of the creation of the government-public defensive organization Public Volunteer Detachments (The Concordia Society Giuhookootai). On July 14, 1938 the State Chamber issued an order about the formation of Volunteer detachment in accordance with which they became closely connected with the youth movement of the Concordia Society and included into the general plan of education of the population.

"Later on at the conference of government representatives and chiefs of the Concordia Society held on December 26, 1940, a decision was taken that the preparatory period of organization was over and in virtue of that Volunteer Detachments of the Concordia Society could become a basic organization of the defense of the country by the population.

"The best age for the rank and file numbers

1 2

of Volunteer Detachments is considered to be between 20 and 40.

"Volunteer Detachments complete the plan of the general mobilization of the population.

"P. 293. The formation of the emigrant bureau.

"Since 1932 numerous organizations of Russian emigrants cropped up everywhere where existed the Russian population, especially in Kharbin.

dated December 28 of the 1st year of Kangte (1934) in accordance with which was created a special organ vested with regard to Russian emigrants with certain administrative functions.

"That organ was called 'Russian emigrant bureau in the Manchurian Empire,' and before it the government set the following tasks:

"1. To contribute to the strengthening of the material and legal status of Russian emigrants living in Manchukuo;

"2. Relations with the authorities of the Empire with regard to questions concerning the emigrants;

"3. Rendering assistance to competent authorities with regard to questions concerning the

11 12

9

10

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

22

23

emigrants.

1

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

The Bureau and the Concordia "P. 300. Society.

"Representing the interests of Russian emigrants the Chief Russian Emigrant Bureau contributes thereby to the cause of building the young empire and realizes the idea of the cooperation of all nations inhabiting the country. The outward expression of this government-political aims of the emigrants is a close connection between the Bureau and the all-Manchurian organization of the Concordia Society.

"P. KATO, Chief of the special department of the Hsinking headquarters of the Concordia Society is concurrently advisor of the chief bureau.

"General Kislitsin, president of the chief bureau, is a director of high courses of the Concordia Society.

"Generally speaking on a number of matters the chief bureau works in close contact with the Concordia Society.

"P. 301.

"The attitude of General YAMAGITA, Chief of the Japanese Imperial Military mission in Kharbin, is especially valuable for the bureau and for all the emigrants as in all matters he has shown himself a real friend and patron of Russian emigrants."

Lefler & Wolf

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

. 24

25

May the witness Major General Grebennik be called.

KUZMA Y. GREBERNIK, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified through Russian interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY GENERAL VASILIEV:

- Q Give your name, middle name and surname, please.
- A Grebennik, Kuzma Yevdokimovich.
- Q What is your military rank?
- A Major General of the Guards, Hero of the Soviet Union.
- Q You are a Deputy -- Member of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, are you not?

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: "Supreme Council of the Soviet Union."

A Yes, I am a Member of the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union.

of the Khassan Border-guard Detachment, were you not?

A Yes, beginning from 1937 and up to 1942 inclusive I was Commanding Officer of the 59th Border-guard Posiet Unit and my rank was Colonel.

C

N.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Mey the witness be shown prosecution's document No. 3353.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

- Q Please examine this document and tell us whether this is your affidavit.
 - A Yes, this is my affidavit.
- Q Are the contents of the affidavit true and correct?
 - A Yes, true and correct.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I offer in evidence prosecution document No. 3353, the affidavit of Major-General Grebennik, Member of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.h., who will testify about the events in the vicinity of Lake Khassan in 1938 to rebut the following evidence offered by the defense:

- 1.) The territory subject of the conflict was not guarded by the Soviet border-guards. They came there for the first time on July 11, 1938, i.e. not long before the outbreak of the conflict, page 22,923 of the transcript.
- 2.) On the territory of the conflict even prior to the commencement of hostilities were the Soviet field troops which built fortifications on the sector which, even according to the contention of the

Soviet side, belonged to Manchuria, pages 22, 716 and 22,896 of the transcript.

3.) In the area of the conflict before the clash the Soviet troops hoisted the red flag on the territory which belonged to Manchuria even according to the Soviet contention, page 22,896 of the record.

The Tribunal will remember that when during the redirect examination of the witness Chernapyatko the prosecutor desired to refute that evidence of the defense Mr. President remarked that "You may be able to give this evidence in rebuttal," page 32,196 of the transcript.

4.) The Soviet troops were the first to start hostilities which began already on July 11, but not on July 29 as contended by the prosecution, pages 22,899 and 22,900 of the transcript.

During the Khassan Lake events the witness Grebennik was a Colonel, Commanding Officer of the border-guard detachment in the Lake Khassan area. His testimony is very valuable for the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, we object to the admission of this evidence on the ground that it is not a proper rebuttal evidence. It should have been part of the case in chief.

17 18

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20 21

22

We further object on the ground that it is purely repetitive. We call attention to the fact that all facts are covered in the following testimony for the prosecution:

Exhibit 753, which was admitted in evidence on page 7755 of the record. This is one of those reports which was prepared for the purposes of this trial, dated, I think, sometime in 1946.

Exhibit 757, which admitted in evidence on page 7813 of the record.

The testimony of the witness Tereshkin, who testified not by affidavit but on question and answer, starting with record page 7767.

The witness Batarshin, whose affidavit was admitted as exhibit 757, page 7811 of the record and who was called to the witness stand at page 32,069 of the record.

The witness Chernopyatko, whose direct testimony first appeared as exhibit 755, record page 7808, and who was called to the witness stand, record page 32,155.

There are no new facts in this affidavit. We submit that it is purely repetitive and should not be received in rebuttal. It is purely repetitive and it

is not important and we therefore do not feel that it meets the tests which the Tribunal has itself set down.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I have given at least four weighty grounds which entitle me to insist that the present witness be examined by the Tribunal.

Apart from the rebuttal point of view, the testimony of this witness is very important and very valuable for the Tribunal -- even from the point of view of the rebuttal it is so -- and the Tribunal made known its decision that this will be the test of what testimony will be admitted or not at this stage of the trial.

I hope that the Tribunal will also bear in mind that the Soviet authorities did not stop at disturbing the work of such competent personalities as General Grebennik, Member of the Soviet Parliament, in order to enable the Tribunal to have a clear picture of the issues involved in this case.

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: Strike out "Member of the Soviet Parliament," please.

GENERAL VASILIEV: (Continued) Therefore, I ask the Tribunal to receive the affidavit in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overraied and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK Q' THE COURT: Prosecution document 3353

-

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

4

.

Man I

will receive exhibit No. 3854.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3854 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read the affidavit, omitting the farmal parts:

time border of the Far Eastern Region in the capacity of the Commander of the 59th Khassan border-guard detachment.

"The detachment was guarding 236 kilometres of the land border facing West and 400 kilometres of the sea border facing East.

"The land border started in the north from the border mark "Letter P," two kilometres to the south-west of the point Shufang, and ran to the south up to the Sea of Japan itself, ending at the town of Chikasimi

"The sea sector of the border started in the north at the Peschanaya bay and ran to the south up to the town of Chikasimi.

"The 59th Khassan border-guard detachment comprised the border-guard outposts Podgornaya and Pakshikori which had the direct responsibility of guarding the border sector to the west of Lake Khassan.

"Heroes of the Soviet Union Lieutenant Colonel Tereshkin and Majors Patarshin and Chernopyatko were my subordinates, when the events in the Lake Khassan area occurred.

"2. The eastern slopes of the Zaozernaya Hill

5

3

7 8

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

24

and the Bezymyannaya Hill (west of Lake Khassan) had always been guarded by the Soviet border-guard forces. Frior to July, 1938, there were no Japanese border guards on the western slopes of the Zaozernaya Hill. I am well acquainted with this sector of the border, because I often went there attaching to it great importance (as it was the place where three borders of the U.S.S.R., Manchuria and Korea met).

nese started massing infantry and artillery in the Zaozernaya Hill area. Japanese troops kept arriving at the area of the villages of Khamoku and Digasheli.

"However, prior to 29 July 1938 there were no armed clashes in the vicinity of the Zaozernaya and Bezymyannaya Hills. In particular, there were no military clashes between the Soviet and the Japanese troops on July 11, 1938.

violation of the state border by Japanese gendarmes, during which one of the trespassers, MATSUSHIMA, Shakuni, was killed.

"The circumstances of this occurrence were as follows:

"On July 15, 1938, Commander of the borderguard outpost Podgornaya, Lieutenant Tereshkin, reported

3 4

1

7

9

11

13

15

14

16

18

20

21

23

to me on the telephone, that a group of Japanese
soldiers had crossed the state border on the Zaozernaya
Hill. The border-guard patrol stationed there had
spotted the trespassers, who at the shout, 'Halt'
started to run back to their territory.

"One of the running men was shot dead with a rifle.

"A pistol with 8 cartridges, a camera, a notebook in which the results of the observation were written down, and a visiting card in the name of MATSUSHIMA, Shakuni, were taken from him. A detailed investigation was conducted in accordance with my order.

"In particular an examination of the foot-prints of the Japanese soldiers at the spot where the border had been trespassed was made. The film found in the camera which had been on the killed gendarme was developed. The examination of the locality revealed foot-prints of 5 persons who had penetrated into the U.S.S.R. territory, and foot-prints of 4 persons leading in the opposite direction, i.s., from the U.S.S.R. to Manchuria. The developed film from the killed Japanese's camera showed 6 pictures, part of which were pictures of our territory, and, in particular, of the Zaozernaya Hill.

"Soon afterwards (I don't remember the date at present) the Japanese sent two Chinese disguised as

5

1

18

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21 22

23 24

truce flag bearers to us, to the sector of the outpost names after Krainov (Karantin). They were holding poles with white flags, and had an envelope addressed to the Commander of the border-guard detachment. These men were detained and brought to me. When the envelope was opened, it turned out that it contained a letter in Japanese. It was translated into Russian, and it was found out that it contained the demand to withdraw our border-guards from the sector west of Lake Khassan addressed 'to the Commander of the Soviet Border-Guard Detachment at Kraskino from the Commander of the Japanese Hanchun Detachment.'

"About five days later a white flag and a letter in the Korean language were found lying on the ground in the vicinity of Novoya-Derevnya, approximately in 100-150 metres from the border.

"The letter was brought to me. Its text corresponds to the text given in the telegram of July 23, 1938, shown to me. (It is attached to exhibit No. 753.)

"It was an anonymous letter bearing no date and no signature.

"Having got such indications we started to premare against an attack on us in the Lake Khassan Area.

"On July 26 I together with a group of officers went to the sector of the Zaozernaya outpost in order to

7 8

observe on the spot what was happening. Since about July 26 or 27 I personally saw the Japanese troops crossing on boats to the eastern bank of the Tumen-Ula River and massing in the area west of the Zaozernaya Hill As the result of the observation of our outposts of the actions of the Japanese it was estimated that more than 3800 men had crossed the river in 3 days during day-time. We were unable to see what these Japanese troops were doing, as they were hiding behind natural rises.

"We tried to avoid giving any, even smallest causes for disputes. No fortification work was done by our border-guards on the western slopes of the Zaozernaya Hill.

"On the hill itself there was only an observation post. This post did not hoist a red flag. On the contrary, it was secretly watching the Japanese.

"5. About 1600 hours on July 29 from the
Zaozernaya Hill I heard the sounds of machine gun, rifle
and mortar fire and grenade explosions in the vicinity
of the Bezymyanaya Hill. I received a message over the
telephone that there appeared a Japanese unit of a company size which had deployed into two groups and launched
an attack on the Bezymyanaya Hill where there was a
patrol of 11 border guards under Lieutenant Makhalin.

"At first I could not personally observe that,

inasmuch as although the distance between the Zaozernaya and Bezymyanaya Hills amounted to not more than 1-1/2 km - there was a fog which considerably reduced visibility. But shortly thereafter after the fog had somewhat lifted I personally saw a platoon of the Japanese infantry which had crossed to our territory between the Bezymyanaya and Zaozernaya Hills.

"I ordered that Sen. Lt. Ratnikov who was attached to me with a group of border guards from the Zaozernaya Hill outfit (one of the members of that group was Major Batarshin who was then a border guard section leader) support Makhalin's patrol from the south.

"At the same time I ordered over the telephone that Sen. Lt. Bykhovtsev, Commanding Officer of the Pakshikori outpost, alert his outposts and use his entire personnel to support Makhalin's patrol from the north.

"It was at that time that I sent a telephone message to the regular Army authorities asking for support since being aware of the strength of the Japanese troops which had crossed the border I felt that I would not be able to hold out against them with my own forces. As a result of this engagement 5 border guards were killed and 6 were wounded. Lieutenant Makhalin was killed.

3

6

8

10

12 13

14

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25.

"Due to the support of the groups under Ratnikov, and Byhovtsev which had arrived in good season the Japanese troops were repulsed off the Bezymyanaya Hill and our unit consolidated there.

on the eastern bank of the Tuman-Ula River in the vicinity of the Zaozernaya Hill were going on on July 30. On the night of 30-31 July the Japanese launched a vigorous attack on the Zaozernaya and Bezymyanaya Hills with artillery support and furling into action the whole of the 19th Infantry Division. By that time the reinforcements of field troops were only reaching the battlefield and the Bezymyanaya and Zaozernaya Hills were defended only by the border guard outfits which had been somewhat reinforced by the reserves I had at my disposal. (There were 92 border guards on the two hills which includes 60 men on the Zaozernaya Hill.)

"At 0625 on July 31 the Japanese occupied the Bezymyanaya and Zaozernaya Hills. Almost the whole of our border guard garrison fell on the battlefields.

"Lieutenant Tereshkin, the Garrison Commander and concurrently the Commanding Officer of the outpost, was wounded. Later on our field troops arrived on the spot and the subsequent operations were conducted under the direction of the regular army authorities.

"In 10 days fighting our regular troops wiped out the units of the 19th Japanese division and repulsed the Japanese off our territory while the remnants of the Japanese troops withdrew to the far bank of the Tuman-Ula River.

"While on the Zaozernaya Hill I commanded my unit in cerbat since the outbreak of hostilities and I can positively state that none of our border guards ever crossed the border line and that the Japanese were the first to start the attack without being in the slightest degree provoked by our border guard. After the defeat of Japanese 19th Infantry Division the Japanese made no claims as to the withdrawal of our troops from the Zaozernaya Hill."

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until nine-thirty tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Tuesday, 27 January 1948, at 0930.)